

REMARKS

In response to the last Office communication, the following has been made.

*Regarding the Claims*

As requested by the Examiner, claims 1-2 and 16-18 have been rewritten in the closest form to the suggested wording from the Examiner so that they could be read at the best possible through the specification. Suggested wording of claims from the Examiner has been found very neat. And it is quite correct to write in claims 1-2 and 16-18 that a frictional force is created between said support part and an interior surface of the transverse hole of said at least one movable arm when last one tilts with respect to said support part. However the specification, in particular page 24, lines 18-30 of the original version, does not say that manual pushing is stopped because tilting occurs but just the opposite, that tilting occurs because manual pushing is stopped. The reaction force that the object opposes the exerted pressure can freely repulse said movable part only when pressure exertion is stopped. Pressure manual exertion is stopped just when hands feel enough resistance, that is to say when hands feel enough reaction force opposed from the clamped object. So applicant suggests in accordance with the specification to insert succinctly between "the positioning operation" and "tilting" what it motives to stop exerting pressure (enough resistance) and to present this stopping as the cause of "tilting".

On the other hand the specification, in particular page 24, lines 15-22 of the original version, also says that positioning an object between arms of an assembler and in contact with its elastic buffer is achieved by sliding said arms along their support part. It would be a chance that arms would be distant from each other just by the thickness of the object plus the thickness of said elastic buffer, when it is decided to clamp said object. Normally, these arms need to be moved to adjust their distance so that the object could be positioned between them and in contact with said elastic buffer. And as this support goes through the arms by their transverse hole, to move these arms, there is no other means but sliding them. So applicant submits to insert "by sliding said at least one movable arm along said

T

support part" in claim 16 of the method of operating the assembler, after "positioning said object between said arms and in contact with said elastic buffer". That would put claim 16 and dependent claims 17 and 18 actually in agreement with the specification.

*Regarding the Drawings*

On top that Figure 14 can be strictly read as a combination of elements according to invention, including two arms, each provided with a transverse hole, the way that this transverse hole is made can be read precisely on the original version of the specification. Page 22, from line 19 to line 24, of this version, it is said that this transverse hole can be made of a shackle (improperly translated by "stirrup" in the version), which is the case in the Figure with element 21. So applicant respectfully entreats the Examiner to reconsider his position regarding the presence of new matter in this Figure 14.

Figures 12 and 13 can also be strictly read each as a combination of elements according to invention, including one support part, two arms and at least one elastic buffer. But moreover the way that these elements are made can be read precisely on the original version of the specification, if it is accepted that "three" can be recognized as having the characteristic of "several". Page 29, from line 11 to line 14, of this version, it is said that this support part is split into several cylindrical and parallel components, which constitute as many parallel and homogeneous supports parts. This is the case in these Figures, where the support part is split into three cylindrical and parallel components 1a, 1b and 1c. Page 29, from line 22 to line 24, of this version, it is said further that said at least one elastic buffer is split into several pieces, which are located at a single distance from the median plane where are located the different cylindrical components of the support part. This is the case in these Figures, where the elastic buffer is split into three components 3ra, 3rb and 3rc. Page 30, from line 1 to line 3, of this version, it is further said that when the elastic buffer is split into several pieces, the arm (implicitly, which carries the buffer) might be itself split into several blocks. This is the case in Figure 13, where the arms are each split into three components 2a, 2b and 2c. Thus Figure 13 exactly reproduces what it is stated page 30, from line 5 to

T

line 7, of this version "it is as if several assemblers according to the invention were coupled together in parallel to make up a multipoint vice". Applicant thinks to have understood that the Examiner rejects these Figures 12-13 for new matter only because "three" would add something to "several". In fact, the Merriam-Webster Dictionary says that "several" as an adjective is "more than two but fewer than many" and the American Heritage Dictionary says about the same thing, "being of a number more than two or three but not many". Would the Examiner accept these Figures 12-13 if replacing "three" by "four" would amend them? Or would he prefer to have on these figures "several" suggested by the addition of a few components both represented and connected to the first components in dashed lines? As a certified mathematician and experienced physicist by more than 20 years of research, applicant can affirm he is used to think and to agree with other mathematicians and physicists that "three" is generally a good and the almost ever selected representation for "several" in an explanatory example. This is commonly admitted within the research world. Hence the Examiner is asked with deference to tell what he would prefer. The fact is that the concept of multiplying the 2-point contacts between a clamp and a clamped object brings a new and unexpected result: making the clamping more secure than by simply increasing the clamping force for one 2-point contact clamp or vice. In particular, that prevents the clamped object to turn when it is worked. A tremendous clamping force exerted by an only one 2-point contact clamp or vice

T

Appn. Number: 08/580,493

cannot prevent a clamped object from turning when it is worked; a clamp with just two 2-point contacts exerting a reasonable clamping force can.

Favorable reconsideration is petitioned with deference.

Applicant thanks in advance the Examiner for any further constructive assistance pursuant to M.P.E.P. §707.07 (j).

Very Respectfully submitted.

*Philippe BERN* *BERNA*

Philippe Berna, Applicant Pro Se

Mailing Address: Mas Liotard - Les Brousses, 30410 Molières-sur-Cèze, France;

Phone and Fax Number: (33) 46 624 3518

---

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper of fifteen pages including this one and the two following ones for the petition for extension of time and for the payment form is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Philippe Berna

*Philippe BERN* *BERNA*

01/25/02

Signature

Date

T